DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 261 584 HE 018 678

AUTHOR Grambsch, Paul V.; And Others
TITLE Institutional Goals. Study of Independent Higher Education in Indiana.
INSTITUTION Associated Colleges of Indiana, Indianapolis.; Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Inc.
SPONS AGENCY Lilly Endowment, Inc., Indianapolis, Ind.
PUB DATE Feb 75
NOTE 74p.; For related documents, see HE 018 677-682.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC03 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Administrator Attitudes; College Faculty; College Presidents; *College Role; Educational Quality; Governance; Higher Education; Institutional Advancement; *Organizational Objectives; *Private Colleges; Questionnaires; Student Development; *Teacher Attitudes
IDENTIFIERS *Indiana; *Institutional Mission

ABSTRACT

As part of a 1974 comprehensive study of private higher education in Indiana, institutional goal perceptions and preferences were investigated, and comparisons to a 1971 study of major U.S. universities were made. Presidents, administrators, and faculty members rated the current importance of 53 goals as well as the importance they believed each goal should have, using the Inventory of Institutional Goals, which is appended. The top seven goals as reported in a composite of all respondents were: insuring confidence of contributors, protecting institutional autonomy, insuring favorable appraisal of those validating the quality of programs, securing financial soundness, keeping costs low, and, in the 6th and 7th positions, developing students' inner character and producing well-rounded students. For preferred goals, the highest preference was to maintain top quality in all programs. Insuring good administration and securing financial soundness were also among the top five goal preferences, as were the student-oriented aims of developing well-rounded students and inner character. Compared to faculty, presidents were more likely to view the goals hierarchy as satisfactory. Faculty respondents felt that involving faculty in institutional governance and insuring democractic procedures were underemphasized, while presidents felt these two goals were overemphasized. (SW)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

William W. Jellema

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

A Report To The
Associated Colleges of Indiana
And The
Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Inc.
By The
Study of Independent Higher Education in Indiana

William W. Jellema, Director
James Olliver, Assistant Director

February, 1975

Additional copies of this report may be purchased at the cost of three dollars ($3.00) per copy from:

Associated Colleges of Indiana
908 Merchants Bank Building
Indianapolis, IN 46204

OR

Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Inc.
306 Guaranty Building
Indianapolis, IN 46204

The Study of Independent Higher Education in Indiana was supported by a grant from the Lilly Endowment, Inc. The positions expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the policies of the Endowment, the Associated Colleges of Indiana, or the Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Inc.

All rights reserved. No part of this report may be reproduced or used in any form without permission of the Associated Colleges of Indiana and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Inc.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword		i
Summary-Preface		v
CHAPTER I	Goal Perceptions	I-1
CHAPTER II	Goal Preferences	II-1
CHAPTER III	Goal Correlations	III-1
CHAPTER IV	Major Goal Discrepancies	IV-1
CHAPTER V	Institutional Distinctions	V-1
Appendix A	Methodology	A-1
Appendix B	Inventory of Institutional Goals	B-1

TABLE OF TABLES

1.	Goal Perceptions--All Respondents	I-2
2.	Goal Perceptions--Faculty	I-8
3.	Goal Perceptions--Administrators	I-10
4.	Goal Perceptions--Presidents	I-14
5.	Goal Preferences--All Respondents	II-4
6.	Goal Preferences--Faculty	II-9
7.	Goal Preferences--Administrators	II-11
8.	Goal Preferences--Presidents	II-13
9.	Sins of Omission and Sins of Commission--All Respondents	IV-2
10.	Sins of Omission and Sins of Commission--Faculty	IV-3
11.	Sins of Omission and Sins of Commission--Administrators	IV-4
12.	Sins of Omission and Sins of Commission--Presidents	IV-5
13.	Rank Order Correlations: Respondent Group	IV-9
14.	Rank Order Correlations: Institutional Types	V-4
15.	Relationship Between "Is" and "Should Be" Using Gamma Scores	V-6
16.	Range of Institutional Diversity	V-8

FOREWORD

The Study of Independent Higher Education in Indiana was commissioned by the Associated Colleges of Indiana and the Independent Colleges and Universities of Indiana, Inc., whose joint boards acted as a steering committee* to provide overall direction for the Study.

Underwritten by the Lilly Endowment, Inc., the Study had, as its major purposes, to enable both the sector as a whole and individual institutions to understand themselves better; and, as a consequence of that understanding, present themselves and their case to the public and to their various constituencies articulately; and, further, to lay the basis and develop the local expertness for the systematic continuing collection of data to satisfy these continuing needs for self-understanding and articulation.

In its year of operation the Study produced six reports on studies that were useful at both the sector level and at the individual institution level. These reports concern themselves with:

Institutional Goals

Cost of Instruction

Student Characteristics and Finances

Financial Health

Interinstitutional Cooperation

Economic Impact

This particular report on institutional goals was prepared largely by Professor Paul V. Grambsch of the University of Minnesota. Dr. Grambsch is the co-author with Professor Edward Gross of the University of Washington, of University Goals and Academic Power (American Council on Education, 1968), and its follow-up study, Changes in University Organization, 1964-1971 (McGraw-Hill, 1974). Dr. Grambsch was assisted, in turn, by Dr. James W. Sweeney and by Stephen Mann, both of the Georgia Institute of Technology, as well as by Linda Thelen, Anne Grambsch, Timothy Sweeney, and Dr. Edward Gross. Their report was modified to accommodate the needs of widespread distribution but theirs is the major credit for the institutional goals study itself as well as for the drafting of the report, and none of the blame for the modifications.

The goals instrument was administered on each college or university campus by the following people who managed to elicit responses from faculty members and administrators at a difficult time of the year:

Anderson College----------Robert A. Nicholson, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Bethel College----------Wayne Gerber, Academic Dean

Butler University----------Paul Stewart, Dean of the University College

Calumet College----------Mike Guiden, Assistant Academic Dean

Concordia Senior College---David Ludwig, Director of Testing

DePauw University----------Larry Elam, Chief Accountant

Earlham College----------Frances Morrison, Administrative Assistant, Research & Testing

Fort Wayne Bible College---Timothy Warner, President

Franklin College----------Noel C. Baker, Vice President for Student Services

Goshen College----------Henry D. Weaver, Provost

Grace College----------E. William Male, Academic Dean

Hanover College----------Harold J. Haverkamp, Academic Dean

Huntington College---------James W. A. Hoffman, Director of Public Relations

Indiana Central College----Paul Pielemeier, Director of Institutional Research

Indiana Institute of Technology----------Evelyn Bowyer, Registrar

Manchester College---------Eldon Fahs, Director of Institutional Research

Marian College----------William Woodman, Dean of Student Services

Marion College----------E. Harold Shigley, Director of Admissions

Northwood Institute--------James McEllhiney, Academic Dean

Oakland City College-------Richard V. Beesley, Dean of the College

Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology----------John A. Logan, President

Saint Francis College------Sr. JoEllen Scheetz, President

Saint Joseph's College-----Martin D. Ryan, Chairman, Department of Sociology

Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College----------Sr. William Eyke, Vice President for Academic Affairs

Saint Mary's College-------Sr. Jeanette Lester, CSC, Institutional Research

Saint Meinrad College------Cajetan White, Registrar

Taylor University----------Tom Beers, Dean of Students

Tri-State College----------William L. Scott, Dean of Students

University of Evansville---Charles Simmons, Vice President for Academic Affairs

University of Notre Dame---Leo Corbaci, Dean of Administration

Valparaiso University------Walter Rubke, Vice President for Student Affairs

Wabash College----------Norman C. Moore, Dean of Students

In the course of the whole Study I have been most ably assisted by James Olliver, as we have been assisted, each in turn by, Elizabeth Shelby, Harriet O'Connor, and Beverly Patterson.

William W. Jellema
Director

February, 1975

---

* Members of the Steering Committee:

Reverend Charles Banet, President, St. Joseph's College
Dr. Richard M. Bateman, President, Tri-State College
Reverend James T. Burtchaell, C.S.C., Provost, University of Notre Dame
Dr. Woodrow Goodman, President, Marion College
Dr. Wallace B. Graves, President, University of Evansville
Dr. John E. Horner, President, Hanover College
Dr. A. G. Huegli, President, Valparaiso University
Dr. Alexander E. Jones, President, Butler University
Dr. John A. Logan, President, Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Dr. John Z. Martin, Executive Director, Associated Colleges of Indiana
Dr. Robert E. Martin, President, Independent Colleges & Universities of Indiana, Inc.
Dr. Robert H. Reardon, President, Anderson College
Dr. Milo A. Rediger, President, Taylor University
Dr. Gene E. Sease, President, Indiana Central College
Dr. Timothy M. Warner, President, Fort Wayne Bible College

SUMMARY-PREFACE

Each of the reports of the Study of Independent Higher Education in Indiana is illuminated by and in turn casts light upon each of the others. This study of institutional goals measures how well the mission of the institution is being served and thus provides the context for analysis of the cost of instruction. The student characteristics and finances data enter dialogue on perceptions of institutional goals from the student perspective. The extent of interinstitutional cooperation an institution undertakes depends in good part on the perceptions and preferences of faculty and administrators concerning such goals as maintaining institutional character and autonomy. The financial health of the institution and concomitantly its economic impact on the community are dependent upon the care with which an institution delineates and adapts its goals in the face of rapidly changing conditions.

The Inventory of Institutional Goals is a modification of an earlier instrument used by Paul V. Grambsch and Edward Gross in 1964 and 1971 to measure goals at major universities across the country. The Inventory sought to discover from presidents, other administrators, and faculty members the degree of importance they believed each of fifty-three goals presently had at their institution, and the degree of importance they believed it should have.

We found that the top five goals as reported in a composite of all respondents concern institutional survival: insure confidence of contributors, protect institutional autonomy, insure favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs, secure financial soundness, and keep costs low. In the 6th and 7th positions were the student-oriented aims of developing inner character and producing well-rounded students. In the 1971 study of universities only two of these goals, insuring confidence of contributors and insuring favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs, ranked in the top ten.

Turning to preferred (or "should be") goals, two student goals in the Indiana survey rise into the top five: develop the inner character of students and produce a well-rounded student. The highest goal preference is to maintain top quality in all programs we engage in. Insuring good administration and securing the institution's financial soundness round out the five top preferences.

Comparing these responses with those of the universities in the Gross and Grambsch 1971 study reveals some major differences. Protecting academic freedom was viewed as the top goal on both the perceived and preferred lists for the universities. This same goal placed tenth on both lists for Indiana respondents. We can

only speculate concerning the reasons for this difference, but it is clear that the respondents in the Indiana study, weighted heavily by faculty, do not feel that the goal is as crucial to institutional functioning and priorities as do their university colleagues. Nor do they believe it should be so overwhelmingly important. We are speaking in a comparative sense here; a goal ranked tenth on the list is obviously still a very important aim.

Perhaps the most interesting differences are found in the student-oriented goals. Both the universities and the Indiana independent institutions rated four such goals in the top ten preferred ("should be") lists--up from two on the perceived ("is") lists.

In this study, and in both studies of major universities, the institutions are concerned with cultivating students' intellect (ranked #2 and #8, respectively) and with developing students' objectivity (#8 and #7). Universities add training students for scholarship and research (#3) and protecting students' right of inquiry (#10) to the top ten. For these last two, Indiana institutions substitute developing the inner character of students (#2) and producing well-rounded students (#3).

One is immediately drawn to the different nature of the student goals. The university goals are cognitive in nature whereas the Indiana institutions prefer affective goals and "synthesis" goals, i.e., a strong desire to enhance the social, aesthetic, and moral growth of students as well as their intellectual development. The actual wording of the second highest preferred goal of Indiana respondents is a call to "develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices". In the university study, this goal was ranked 42nd on the perceived and 16th on the preferred, down from an earlier 38th on perceived and 12th on the preferred when the same survey was conducted in 1964.

Judging from the relatively higher position occupied by the student oriented goals on the preference scale, and the lower rating given to the "survival" goals, we presume that these institutions regret the imposition and threat of financial and credentialing exigencies. It is clear that they would like to place their emphasis on operating a well-run institution using the best management techniques, maintaining all programs at a high level of quality, and making a definite impact on the intellectual growth and character development of the students.

Turning to the lowest or least important goals there is again a major difference between Indiana institutions and the universities. In Indiana, research, both pure and applied, is found to have the

lowest priority both as a perceived goal and as a goal preference. While we assumed that these institutions were not highly research oriented, this low composite rating came as a mild surprise. The universities, by contrast, rated applied research 8th on the perceived scale and 21st on the preferred, with pure research 15th and 27th, respectively. (These relatively low preferred ratings in universities may also surprise some, even in higher education, who assume a primacy of interest in these areas on the part of major universities.) Also given a low rating by the Indiana respondents were goals supporting student political action and freedom of lifestyle.

When we separately examine the responses of faculty members and presidents some notable differences occur. As measured by a change of nine or more places from perceived to preferred, both groups believe that the goals of rewarding individuals based on their contributions to the institution and of insuring good administration are underemphasized. Both groups believe that the goals of preparing students for useful careers, protecting student freedom of lifestyle and protecting institutional autonomy are overemphasized. (It should be noted, however, that protecting autonomy remains high on the list of preferred goals.) Preserving institutional character dropped from 7th to 42nd for faculty members while the presidents perceived the goal already to be below the middle of the list of priorities (32nd) and preferred for it to remain there (34th). In general, it appears that the presidents are more inclined to believe that the goals hierarchy is about as it should be than are the faculties. Furthermore, the presidents tend to rank many more goal preferences as "very important" than do the faculties.

Two aims which the faculties maintain are underemphasized but that the presidents feel are overemphasized are involving faculty in institutional governance and insuring that the institution is run democratically. We find this difference neither surprising nor alarming. Moreover, while presidents appear more satisfied with the current status of the institution than either faculties or other administrators, there is more uniformity in all groups at the bottom than at the top. In other words, Indiana's independent colleges and universities are in better agreement on what they are <u>not</u> and what they should <u>not</u> be, than on what they are and what they should be.

The institutions are not equal either in their perceptions or in their preferences. Some goals are at the top of the list for some institutions that are at the bottom of the list for others. The goal to sharpen students' awareness of their religious heritage and deepen their theological understanding runs the broadest gamut of all.

Even so, however, diversity appears threatened. In sixteen instances on the perception ("is") scale, goals ranked in the top ten by at least one institution are ranked in the bottom ten by at least one other institution. On the preferred ("should be") scale this happens only five times.

The high rank order correlations on the perception scale among institutions (discussed in chapter five) reveal a similarity of viewpoint and outlook between groups of institutions categorized according to the Carnegie Commission's classification system. The still higher correlations on the preference scale, moreover, strongly suggest that if all of these institutions achieve the goals to which they aspire, they will be even less different from one another than they are presently. This suggests that the diversity they elsewhere espouse may be significantly attenuated. A comparable study of goal perceptions and preferences in Indiana public institutions would be useful to see if the movement from perception to preference is comparable to that in the independent sector.

Maintaining a diverse and viable dual system of higher education ought to be an important consideration in Indiana. This study suggests that there is room for reconsideration of goal preferences in individual institutions in order to preserve diversity between the sectors and among institutions. Viewed in this light, the fact that the goal of preserving the peculiar emphasis and character of the institution falls from 9th on the perceived scale to 40th on the preferred may not be altogether salutory.

If maintaining a diverse and viable dual system of higher education is an important consideration in Indiana, we question the adequacy of institutional and public policy which leaves survival, rather than student-affective goals at the top of the scale.

CHAPTER I

GOAL PERCEPTIONS

The central purpose of this study of goals is to enable the administrators and the faculty to gain further understanding of their respective institutions and to assist them in making decisions and in planning for the future. In particular, we hope they will gain some insights into the kind of institution they are and are not (goal perceptions), and the kind of institution they aspire to become (goal preferences). The second purpose of this study is to enable the independent sector to discover and comment on the degree of diversity present among its institutions as that diversity is measured by differences in goals being pursued.

Table 1 represents the respondents' perceptions of goals for private institutions of higher education in Indiana.[1] Because of the small differences often found in the mean scores which determine the rank of the goal, it is well to keep in mind not only the number one goal but the top ten and bottom ten goals as a group. The top and bottom ten goals are those the respondents have judged most and least important, but the exact order is not especially meaningful. This allows some 30 goals in the middle ranges which certainly should not be ignored. The middle group, however, is better analyzed by indicating comparisons between the goal perceptions and the goal preferences.

---

[1] The reader is encouraged to examine exactly how the question was worded on the Inventory of Institutional Goals, a copy of which is appended to this report as Appendix B.

TABLE 1

GOAL PERCEPTIONS--ALL RESPONDENTS

GOAL #	(N)	AVE	ST DEV		Is	Should Be
40	1480	2.071	0.761	Insure Confidence of Contributors	1	15
12	1475	2.164	0.849	Protect Institution's Autonomy	2	13
31	1466	2.298	0.748	Insure Favorable Appraisal of Those Validating Quality of Programs	3	27
50	1406	2.307	0.902	Secure Institution's Financial Soundness	4	5
26	1475	2.386	0.840	Keep Costs Low	5	21
29	1484	2.397	0.840	Produce a Well-Rounded Student	6	3
8	1497	2.427	0.928	Develop Inner Character of Students	7	2
1	1452	2.443	0.820	Establish and Articulate Purposes of Institution	8	9
23	1466	2.448	0.971	Preserve Institution's Character	9	40
4	1498	2.459	0.870	Protect Faculty's Academic Freedom	10	10
37	1502	2.482	0.774	Prepare Students for Careers	11	30
45	1496	2.487	0.832	Increase Prestige of Institution	12	18
34	1474	2.560	0.810	Produce Good Citizens	13	14
22	1504	2.575	0.885	Maintain Top Quality in All Programs	14	1
15	1478	2.583	0.833	Keep Up to Date	15	6
17	1501	2.666	0.825	Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity	16	11
36	1490	2.669	0.855	Help Students Criticize Themselves	17	7
42	1476	2.676	0.952	Create Sense of Community	18	16
49	1487	2.677	1.118	Deepen Theological Understanding	19	34
21	1456	2.686	0.967	Insure Good Administration	20	4
7	1486	2.688	0.832	Cultivate Intellect of Students	21	8
32	1476	2.707	0.828	Maintain Quality Across Range of Programs	22	20
43	1495	2.713	0.932	Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance	23	22
44	1499	2.737	0.765	Provide Student Activities	24	32
24	1450	2.738	0.819	Maximize Students' Possible High Status	25	36
46	1486	2.754	0.859	Protect Students' Right of Inquiry	26	24
6	1492	2.773	0.905	Develop Loyalty to Institution	27	23
14	1503	2.805	0.842	Develop Greater Pride in the Institution	28	12
38	1507	2.814	0.781	Provide Cultural Leadership	29	31

16	1468	2.816	0.797	Influence Students by Great Ideas	30	25
48	1464	2.855	0.962	Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs	31	47
9	1493	2.872	0.867	Elevate Student Culturally	32	17
33	1492	2.889	0.994	Insure Institution is Run Democratically	33	26
11	1494	2.915	0.923	Educate Students Fully	34	28
20	1509	2.917	0.902	Involve Students in Institutional Governance	35	44
3	1483	2.945	0.712	Encourage Students Toward Graduate Studies	36	43
18	1475	2.966	0.894	Preserve Cultural Heritage	37	37
13	1487	3.009	0.885	Increase Faculty's Career Opportunities	38	33
2	1463	3.085	0.808	Protect Student Freedom	39	48
27	1443	3.103	0.835	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Institution	40	19
47	1464	3.107	0.875	Seek Interinstitutional Cooperation	41	38
10	1493	3.146	0.910	Disseminate New Ideas	42	29
19	1490	3.208	0.874	Satisfy Regional Needs	43	45
41	1453	3.220	0.846	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Professional Discipline	44	35
53	1343	3.225	0.872	Hold Staff From Other Institution's Inducements	45	39
30	1442	3.234	0.878	Provide Direct Assistance to Citizens	46	41
28	1428	3.300	0.843	Protect Students' Right of Direct Political Action	47	49
52	1434	3.308	0.948	Insure Will of Full-Time Faculty Prevails	48	46
5	1469	3.346	1.073	Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students	49	42
35	1486	3.378	0.929	Accommodate Highly Qualified Students Only	50	51
51	1424	3.560	0.899	Allow for Many Culture and Lifestyles	51	50
39	1435	3.712	0.807	Carry On Applied Research	52	52
25	1427	3.984	0.820	Carry On Pure Research	53	53

$r_s = .7858$

The top ten goals as seen by all respondents in this study are as follows:

Goal No.

40. Insure confidence of contributors.

12. Protect institution's autonomy.

31. Insure favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs.

50. Secure institution's financial soundness.

26. Keep costs low.

29. Produce a well-rounded student.

8. Develop inner character of students.

1. Establish and articulate purposes of institution.

23. Preserve institution's character.

4. Protect faculty's academic freedom.

The only two goals that relate directly to output are those of producing well-rounded students and of developing the inner character of students. We have classified the others as supporting goals. The two output goals suggest the nature of the institutions in the study. As a contrast to this high rank, the 1971 study of university goals found these two goals in 18th and 28th places respectively, ranking well below such student-oriented goals as training students in scholarship and cultivating students' intellect. It is quite evident that taken as a whole the institutions in the Indiana study tend to emphasize a philosophy of general education with strong moral overtones.

The support goals making up the other eight places out of the top ten are strongly oriented toward survival and protecting the institution itself. The "all respondents" table is heavily weighted by faculty, and thus it is some indication that faculty as well as administrators are impressed with the seriousness of the problems of survival. These institutions are all small enough so that communications within the school regarding the critical problems of survival are evidently good. It is not surprising, therefore, that the top five goals deal with problems of adapting to various elements of

the environment in which the institutions find themselves and in managing their affairs in such a way as to preserve the autonomy of the institutions and to insure confidence of contributors.

The high place (third) afforded the goal of insuring favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs may first appear incongruous with the other goals listed of top importance. It must be kept in mind, however, that the loss of the favorable appraisal of programs would be a serious blow to any of these schools and in some cases would undoubtedly sound the death knell. In the university study in 1971, this goal ranked number six, thus providing additional evidence that American education has been greatly concerned with appearing to show up in a favorable light by peer groups evaluating academic programs.

It is interesting to note that the number one goal of universities in studies conducted both in 1964 and in 1971, the protection of academic freedom, ranked only tenth in the Indiana private college study. While this is certainly a high rating, it is not the overwhelmingly high score given in universities. Academic freedom does not appear to be a burning issue on these campuses, perhaps because their faculty members do not feel threatened on this score as their counterparts at large research-oriented universities sometimes do, or perhaps because a rigid definition of academic freedom is tempered on these campuses by the shared conviction of a common point of view.

The bottom ten goals are interesting and, at least in several cases, different from those of universities. These ten, starting at the bottom are:

Goal No.	
25.	Carry on pure research.
39.	Carry on applied research.
51.	Allow for many cultures and lifestyles in the institution.
35.	Accommodate highly qualified students only.
5.	Provide special training for part-time adult students.

52. Insure that the will of the full-time faculty prevails.

28. Protect the students' right of direct political action.

30. Provide direct assistance to citizens.

53. Hold staff in the face of inducements from other institutions.

41. Reward individuals based on their contribution to a professional discipline.

Most striking, of course, is the finding of the two research goals as the lowest ranking goals (53rd and 52nd). This factor, more than any other, indicates the difference between the schools in this study, which are mostly colleges, and universities. In the 1971 university study, the goal of carrying on pure research ranked 8th and the goal of carrying on applied research ranked 15th. In both of these cases, the ranking was even higher in 1964. It is not merely a question of doing research itself, but all that the research goals imply. Research invariably places an emphasis upon graduate students and upon library and research facilities. The difference is not one therefore merely of faculty orientation but a difference in overall educational philosophy and output.

The other goals in the bottom group all have special import of their own, although they are difficult to classify. It is not surprising, for example, that the goal of accepting only highly qualified students is of little importance in this day of declining enrollments. While colleges may profess to be highly selective in admissions, the pressures for revenue have blunted any thought of exclusiveness or eliteness insofar as the student body is concerned. Also, it must be kept in mind that among the top student goals are those of developing the inner moral character of students and producing a well-rounded individual. Neither of these goals are considered to be compatible with any type of exclusion.

The two goals, protecting the students' rights to direct action of a political and social nature and insuring that the will of the full-time faculty prevails, are both tied to the idea of organizational radicalism. In the former case, the exercise of student power has been perceived as a threat to the institution itself. Hence

administrators and faculties alike are concerned. In the latter case, even among faculty members themselves, the prospect of greatly increasing their power is viewed as a radical step and one that may threaten the institution itself if it is used unwisely. That these goals rank low is not surprising.

Finally, among the bottom group are two goals best thought of as the service goals, namely assisting citizens through extension programs and providing special adult training through part-time coursework. These are the hallmarks of state universities and are not found in private institutions to the same degree. This is true at universities as well as colleges.

Tables 2, 3 and 4 are subtables of table 1. Table 2 presents the findings for the faculty members who are respondents. This table is similar to table 1 because the faculty respondents are by far the larger portion of total respondents. In the top ten goals, the only change, and it is not a substantial one, finds the goal of maintaining academic freedom of the faculty has moved out of the top ten to twelfth place. Taking its place in the number ten position is "to prepare students for useful careers." This is certainly not a major change, so all that has been said for the total respondents applies to the faculties as well.

The same is true for the bottom ten goals, which are identical on the two lists.

Table 3 presents the subgroup of administrators who have identified themselves on the questionnaire. Their positions are not known except that they are not the presidents of their respective institutions. Whether or not they also hold faculty status is not known. Their number, while not substantial, may be of considerable importance because of a strategic locational value in each school. A dean of students, for example, or an academic dean may have considerable influence over such matters as curriculum, reward systems of faculty, and similar matters.

TABLE 2

GOAL PERCEPTIONS--FACULTY

GOAL #	(N)	AVE	ST DEV		Is	Should Be
40	1119	2.052	0.779	Insure Confidence of Contributors	1	16
12	1110	2.193	0.857	Protect Institution's Autonomy	2	13
31	1104	2.306	0.765	Insure Favorable Appraisal of Those Validating Quality of Programs	3	26
50	1053	2.309	0.897	Secure Institution's Financial Soundness	4	6
26	1114	2.381	0.842	Keep Costs Low	5	24
29	1121	2.425	0.847	Produce a Well-Rounded Student	6	3
23	1107	2.432	0.986	Preserve Institution's Character	7	42
8	1131	2.445	0.932	Develop Inner Character of Students	8	2
1	1089	2.453	0.819	Establish and Articulate Purposes of Institution	9	11
37	1136	2.504	0.767	Prepare Students for Careers	10	31
45	1130	2.505	0.844	Increase Prestige of Institution	11	20
4	1133	2.525	0.880	Protect Faculty's Academic Freedom	12	7
34	1115	2.583	0.806	Produce Good Citizens	13	14
15	1114	2.610	0.846	Keep Up To Date	14	5
22	1137	2.620	0.890	Maintain Top Quality in All Programs	15	1
17	1138	2.688	0.828	Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity	16	10
36	1128	2.694	0.866	Help Students Criticize Themselves	17	9
49	1124	2.697	1.123	Deepen Theological Understanding	18	36
42	1112	2.715	0.963	Create Sense of Community	19	15
21	1097	2.723	0.977	Insure Good Administration	20	4
7	1122	2.731	0.832	Cultivate Intellect of Students	21	8
44	1134	2.734	0.770	Provide Student Activities	22	33
32	1115	2.747	0.837	Maintain Quality Across Range of Programs	23	21
24	1099	2.750	0.821	Maximize Students' Possible High Status	24	35
46	1123	2.764	0.868	Protect Students' Right of Inquiry	25	22
6	1124	2.774	0.905	Develop Loyalty to Institution	26	27
43	1131	2.777	0.947	Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance	27	19
38	1141	2.819	0.782	Provide Cultural Leadership	28	32
14	1135	2.820	0.851	Develop Greater Pride in the Institution	29	12

16	1111	2.848	0.784	Influence Students by Great Ideas	30	25
48	1110	2.864	0.971	Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs	31	47
9	1129	2.913	0.870	Elevate Student Culturally	32	17
11	1130	2.939	0.945	Educate Students Fully	33	29
20	1139	2.951	0.915	Involve Students in Institutional Governance	34	45
33	1128	2.955	1.005	Insure Institution is Run Democratically	35	23
18	1115	2.966	0.905	Preserve Cultural Heritage	36	37
3	1122	2.975	0.718	Encourage Students Toward Graduate Studies	37	44
13	1123	3.054	0.886	Increase Faculty's Career Opportunities	38	30
2	1105	3.120	0.805	Protect Student Freedom	39	48
47	1104	3.129	0.885	Seek Interinstitutional Cooperation	40	38
10	1131	3.148	0.908	Disseminate New Ideas	41	28
27	1090	3.157	0.846	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Institution	42	18
19	1123	3.203	0.893	Satisfy Regional Needs	43	46
30	1089	3.234	0.894	Provide Direct Assistance to Citizens	44	41
41	1102	3.288	0.845	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Professional Discipline	45	34
53	1003	3.294	0.880	Hold Staff from Other Institution's Inducements	46	39
28	1079	3.316	0.854	Protect Students' Right of Direct Political Action	47	49
5	1115	3.339	1.081	Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students	48	43
52	1086	3.358	0.945	Insure Will of Full-Time Faculty Prevails	49	40
35	1123	3.413	0.934	Accommodate Highly Qualified Students Only	50	52
51	1081	3.577	0.912	Allow for Many Cultures and Lifestyles	51	50
39	1089	3.695	0.802	Carry On Applied Research	52	51
25	1086	3.976	0.813	Carry On Pure Research	53	53

$r_s = .7257$

TABLE 3

GOAL PERCEPTIONS--ADMINISTRATORS

GOAL #	(N)	AVE	ST DEV		Is	Should Be
12	315	2.073	0.831	Protect Institution's Autonomy	1	12
40	313	2.127	0.695	Insure Confidence of Contributors	2	9
4	314	2.203	0.789	Protect Faculty's Academic Freedom	3	21
31	313	2.265	0.704	Insure Favorable Appraisal of Those Validating Quality of Programs	4	26
50	303	2.297	0.915	Secure Institution's Financial Soundness	5	4
29	312	2.298	0.808	Produce a Well-Rounded Student	6	3
8	313	2.373	0.915	Develop Inner Character of Students	7	1
26	312	2.394	0.818	Keep Costs Low	8	16
22	316	2.398	0.823	Maintain Top Quality in All Programs	9	2
37	313	2.412	0.780	Prepare Students for Careers	10	25
1	312	2.413	0.836	Establish and Articulate Purposes of Institution	11	6
45	313	2.447	0.774	Increase Prestige of Institution	12	18
34	310	2.464	0.806	Produce Good Citizens	13	13
15	313	2.492	0.789	Keep Up To Date	14	8
43	312	2.493	0.852	Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance	15	30
23	309	2.508	0.913	Preserve Institution's Character	16	35
7	311	2.527	0.829	Cultivate Intellect of Students	17	14
21	312	2.551	0.919	Insure Good Administration	18	5
36	312	2.560	0.827	Help Students Criticize Themselves	19	15
42	314	2.563	0.913	Create Sense of Community	20	10
32	314	2.576	0.788	Maintain Quality Across Range of Programs	21	22
17	312	2.583	0.825	Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity	22	17
49	310	2.625	1.103	Deepen Theological Understanding	23	24
16	307	2.667	0.824	Influence Students by Great Ideas	24	23
33	312	2.676	0.932	Insure Institution is Run Democratically	25	31
24	302	2.695	0.790	Maximize Students' Possible High Status	26	32
46	312	2.698	0.813	Protect Students' Right of Inquiry	27	29
9	314	2.745	0.833	Elevate Student Culturally	28	20
44	313	2.750	0.747	Provide Student Activities	29	28

14	317	2.769	0.815	Develop Greater Pride in the Institution	30	7
6	316	2.787	0.888	Develop Loyalty to Institution	31	11
48	307	2.801	0.923	Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs	32	47
20	316	2.803	0.857	Involve Students in Institutional Governance	33	42
38	314	2.821	0.791	Provide Cultural Leadership	34	34
3	311	2.832	0.670	Encourage Students Toward Graduate Studies	35	40
13	313	2.846	0.859	Increase Faculty's Career Opportunities	36	44
11	313	2.849	0.850	Educate Students Fully	37	27
2	306	2.915	0.767	Protect Student Freedom	38	46
27	306	2.928	0.760	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Institution	39	19
18	310	2.958	0.878	Preserve Cultural Heritage	40	37
53	294	3.006	0.813	Hold Staff From Other Institution's Inducements	41	41
41	302	3.023	0.812	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Professional Discipline	42	36
47	310	3.074	0.857	Seek Interinstitutional Cooperation	43	38
10	315	3.120	0.919	Disseminate New Ideas	44	33
52	298	3.151	0.957	Insure Will of Full-Time Faculty Prevails	45	49
28	301	3.215	0.789	Protect Students' Right of Direct Political Action	46	48
35	314	3.242	0.893	Accommodate Highly Qualified Students Only	47	50
19	314	3.248	0.796	Satisfy Regional Needs	48	43
30	307	3.260	0.818	Provide Direct Assistance to Citizens	49	45
5	303	3.419	1.038	Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students	50	39
51	294	3.517	0.849	Allow for Many Cultures and Lifestyles	51	51
39	297	3.787	0.829	Carry on Applied Research	52	52
25	295	4.000	0.857	Carry on Pure Research	53	53

$r_s = .8074$

While these administrators do not differ substantially from faculty in their judgment regarding the top ten perceived goals, it is interesting to note that the goal of protecting the faculty's academic freedom has moved up to third position. In other words, administrators actually rank this goal higher by nine places than the faculties do. Since (as we shall see) this group drops this goal on the preferred list to twenty-first position, we may infer that academic freedom appears to them to be an issue that rises up on the slightest provocation to inhibit administrative endeavors. The other goals in the top ten which have not appeared in the earlier tables are: (a) maintain top quality in all programs and (b) prepare students for useful careers. These have only changed places within the ranking of the top ten and hence represent only minor changes. The bottom ranking goals as listed by administrators are also not much different than for faculty or for all respondents.

Turning now to table 4, responses of presidents, we see that they also are not vastly different, either at the top or at the bottom, from those of the faculty members.

The main difference in the presidents' perceptions of the top goals from those of the faculties is found in the two goals: insure favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs and preserve the institution's character. Both are perceived to rank well down the list according to the presidents in contrast to the faculty. Evidently the faculties perceive these institutions to be much more interested in insuring favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs and in preserving the institution's special or unique characters than the presidents do. Neither faculty members nor presidents think that these goals ought to be as high as they are and both groups drop them down on their preferred list. Whether this means that they now feel secure about favorable appraisal of programs, for example, or only that in a happier future situation they look forward to relegating this concern to a markedly lower position, is not clear. The lack of enthusiasm for preserving the institutions' unique or special characters--thirty-fourth on the presidents' preferred list, forty-second on the faculties'--requires imagination for interpretation. It probably indicates a healthy willingness on the part of both parties to adapt to new situations. It may also mean, unhappily, a dimunition of the sector's diversity and distinctiveness.

The presidents' bottom ranking goals are similar to those of the faculty and other administrators. This fact certainly speaks well for communication within the various institutions, because it is apparent that the presidents and the others in the institution have reasonably similar views not only as to what is of great importance but also what is of little importance.

TABLE 4

GOAL PERCEPTIONS--PRESIDENTS

GOAL #	(N)	AVE	ST DEV		Presidents	All Respondents	Administrators	Faculty	Is	Should Be
1	32	1.656	0.745	Establish and Articulate Purposes of Institution	1	8	11	9	1	1
12	32	1.687	0.820	Protect Institution's Autonomy	2	2	1	2	2	10
40	31	1.774	0.668	Insure Confidence of Contributors	3	1	2	1	3	4
50	31	1.806	0.833	Secure Institution's Financial Soundness	4	4	5	4	4	3
4	31	1.870	0.670	Protect Faculty's Academic Freedom	5	10	3	12	5	16
8	32	1.906	0.856	Develop Inner Character of Students	6	7	7	8	6	2
22	31	1.935	0.892	Maintain Top Quality in All Programs	7	14	9	15	7	5
26	32	1.937	0.759	Keep Costs Low	8	5	8	5	8	7
29	32	2.031	0.860	Produce a Well-Rounded Student	9	6	6	6	9	6
42	31	2.064	0.892	Create Sense of Community	10	18	20	19	10	9
37	31	2.096	0.650	Prepare Students for Careers	11	11	10	10	11	31
43	30	2.133	0.776	Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance	12	23	15	27	12	27
6	32	2.156	0.846	Develop Loyalty to Institution	13	27	31	26	13	14
14	32	2.156	0.883	Develop Greater Pride in the Institution	14	28	30	29	14	12
32	32	2.156	0.766	Maintain Quality Across Range of Programs	15	22	21	23	15	22
49	31	2.193	1.222	Deepen Theological Understanding	16	19	23	18	16	19
15	32	2.218	0.832	Keep Up To Date	17	15	14	14	17	13
16	32	2.218	0.974	Influence Students By Great Ideas	18	30	24	30	18	8
7	32	2.218	0.832	Cultivate Intellect of Students	19	21	17	21	19	15
21	31	2.225	0.844	Insure Good Administration	20	20	18	20	20	11
31	32	2.250	0.762	Insure Favorable Appraisal of Those Validating Quality of Programs	21	3	4	3	21	25
36	31	2.258	0.815	Help Students Criticize Themselves	22	17	19	17	22	17
33	32	2.281	0.728	Insure Institution is Run Democratically	23	33	25	35	23	30
34	32	2.281	0.851	Produce Good Citizens	24	13	13	13	24	20
45	31	2.290	0.824	Increase Prestige of Institution	25	12	12	11	25	26
9	32	2.312	0.895	Elevate Student Culturally	26	32	28	32	26	21
17	32	2.343	0.653	Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity	27	16	22	16	27	23
27	32	2.406	0.712	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Institution	28	40	39	42	28	18
46	31	2.451	0.850	Protect Students' Right of Inquiry	29	26	27	25	29	28

2	29	2.482	0.633	Protect Student Freedom	30	39	38	39	30	40
44	31	2.483	0.811	Provide Student Activities	31	24	29	22	31	27
23	31	2.516	1.150	Preserve Institution's Character	32	9	16	7	32	34
18	32	2.531	0.841	Preserve Cultural Heritage	33	37	40	36	33	33
11	32	2.531	0.949	Educate Students Fully	34	34	37	33	34	24
24	30	2.566	0.817	Maximize Students' Possible High Status	35	25	26	24	35	35
13	31	2.580	0.764	Increase Faculty's Career Opportunities	36	38	36	35	36	41
53	30	2.600	0.770	Hold Staff From Other Institution's Inducements	37	45	41	46	37	43
41	30	2.600	0.770	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Professional Discipline	38	44	42	45	38	38
38	31	2.612	0.760	Provide Cultural Leadership	39	29	34	28	39	32
47	30	2.633	0.889	Seek Interinstitutional Cooperation	40	41	43	40	40	36
48	30	2.733	1.112	Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs	41	31	32	31	41	39
10	32	2.750	0.983	Disseminate New Ideas	42	42	44	41	42	37
20	32	2.750	0.803	Involve Students in Institutional Governance	43	35	33	34	43	45
3	30	2.766	0.504	Encourage Students Toward Graduate Studies	44	36	35	37	44	42
28	31	2.935	0.771	Protect Students' Right of Direct Political Action	45	47	46	47	45	48
30	32	3.062	0.800	Provide Direct Assistance to Citizens	46	46	49	44	46	47
52	31	3.064	1.123	Insure Will of Full-Time Faculty Prevails	47	48	45	49	47	50
19	31	3.096	0.650	Satisfy Regional Needs	48	43	48	43	48	46
35	32	3.187	0.931	Accommodate Highly Qualified Students Only	49	50	47	50	49	49
5	32	3.218	1.007	Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students	50	49	50	48	50	44
51	30	3.366	0.889	Allow for Many Cultures and Lifestyles	51	51	51	51	51	51
39	29	3.655	0.813	Carry on Applied Research	52	52	52	52	52	52
25	31	3.903	0.830	Carry on Pure Research	53	53	53	53	53	53

I-15

$r_s = .9244$

CHAPTER II

GOAL PREFERENCES

We turn now to the goal preferences or the "should be" rankings for the same kind of analysis. The goal preferences are found in tables 5 through 8. Goal preferences are intentions, not reality. Because most people in organizations believe there is room for improvement within the organization, there is a tendency for preferences to be scored higher than the perceived goals. We can only assume that the respondents actually heeded the admonition on the front page of the questionnaire and approached the "should be" in such fashion as reflected the realities of resources.[1] The fact that the entire range of scores is much higher is the best indication we have that their answers reflect a normal response based on experience in other studies. Furthermore, the fact that standard deviations on the goal preferences are no larger, and are in many cases even smaller, than those of the goals perceptions themselves is an indication that if the respondents did not heed the admonition of the front page about looking at preferences realistically, they at least erred in the same direction. Had some people followed an unrealistic pattern with respect to preferences, the standard deviations would undoubtedly have been much higher.

The top ten goal preferences ("should be") of all respondents of this study are as follows (table 5):

Goal No.

22. Maintain top quality in all programs.

8. Develop the inner character of students.

29. Produce a well-rounded student.

---

[1] In responding to the "should be" aspect of these goals, keep in mind the resource limitations of your institution. Since many of these goals have implications for the time, talent and financial resources of your institution, it may be that some goals can become more important only if some others become less important.

21. Insure good administration.

50. Secure the institution's financial soundness.

15. Keep up to date.

36. Help students develop objectivity to examine beliefs critically.

7. Cultivate intellect of students.

1. Establish and articulate the purposes of the institution.

4. Protect faculty's academic freedom.

It is readily apparent that the student goals are greater in number in the top ten than they were in the "is" ranking. The two student goals common to both lists ("is" and "should be") concern the development of students' inner character and the production of well-rounded students. These two, however, are joined in the preference list by two more, indicating that the respondents certainly believe that they can do a better job of working with students than is now the case. The fact that student-oriented goals tend to rise to the top forces one to conclude that Indiana's college educators have the same "guilty conscience" one finds in universities where the same situation is observed.

The rest of the goal preferences in the top ten all have to do with the institution's management and its need for maintaining its position. In other words, the preferences seem to be for a well-run institution using the best in management techniques, maintaining all its programs at a high level, and making a definite impact upon students, their intellect, and their character. Whether this ideal is ever achieved, it certainly represents the preferences of the respondents for the ideal of liberal education in a well-managed collegiate setting.

Next we turn to the opposite extreme, namely the bottom-ranked goal preferences. Starting with the very lowest ranked preferred goal, the bottom ten are as follows:

Goal No.

25. Carry on pure research.

39. Carry on applied research.

35. Accommodate highly qualified students only.

51. Allow for many cultures and lifestyles in the institution.

28. Protect the student's right of direct political action.

2. Protect students' right to freedom of dress and social patterns.

48. Emphasize liberal arts even at the expense of preprofessional, pregraduate, or vocational programs.

52. Insure that the will of the full-time faculty prevails.

19. Satisfy regional needs.

20. Involve students in the governance of the institution.

The most striking findings are, of course, the two research goal preferences ranked at the very bottom. Evidently, the respondents believe that even the idealized version of their respective institutions does not permit emphasis upon research. This is, of course, different from the goal preferences in universities.

TABLE 5

GOAL PREFERENCES--ALL RESPONDENTS

GOAL #	(N)	AVE	ST DEV	
22	1509	1.669	0.693	Maintain Top Quality in All Programs
8	1492	1.700	0.761	Develop Inner Character of Students
29	1480	1.739	0.692	Produce a Well-Rounded Student
21	1472	1.807	0.762	Insure Good Administration
50	1426	1.837	0.728	Secure Institution's Financial Soundness
15	1484	1.842	0.656	Keep Up To Date
36	1502	1.908	0.698	Help Students Criticize Themselves
7	1484	1.909	0.870	Cultivate Intellect of Students
1	1450	1.911	0.709	Establish and Articulate Purposes of Institution
4	1499	1.922	0.745	Protect Faculty's Academic Freedom
17	1507	1.944	0.676	Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity
14	1509	1.972	0.748	Develop Greater Pride in the Institution
12	1480	2.002	0.815	Protect Institution's Autonomy
34	1493	2.036	0.724	Produce Good Citizens
40	1486	2.039	0.727	Insure Confidence of Contributors
42	1483	2.047	0.744	Create Sense of Community
9	1500	2.072	0.836	Elevate Student Culturally
45	1497	2.076	0.731	Increase Prestige of Institution
27	1475	2.080	0.728	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Institution
32	1486	2.096	0.769	Maintain Quality Across Range of Programs
26	1481	2.143	0.758	Keep Costs Low
43	1504	2.148	0.750	Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance
6	1505	2.179	0.838	Develop Loyalty to Institution
46	1497	2.197	0.797	Protect Students' Right of Inquiry
16	1467	2.201	0.833	Influence Students by Great Ideas

33	1497	2.209	0.793	Insure Institution is Run Democratically
31	1477	2.250	0.770	Insure Favorable Appraisal of Those Validating Quality of Programs
11	1485	2.272	0.948	Educate Students Fully
10	1500	2.292	0.912	Disseminate New Ideas
37	1503	2.310	0.789	Prepare Students for Careers
38	1502	2.376	0.724	Provide Cultural Leadership
44	1501	2.389	0.742	Provide Student Activities
13	1492	2.422	0.911	Increase Faculty's Career Opportunities
49	1481	2.460	1.175	Deepen Theological Understanding
41	1480	2.467	0.879	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Professional Discipline
24	1453	2.501	0.905	Maximize Students' Possible High Status
18	1481	2.550	0.900	Preserve Cultural Heritage
47	1465	2.580	0.879	Seek Interinstitutional Cooperation
53	1364	2.634	0.865	Hold Staff from Other Institution's Inducements
23	1464	2.635	1.102	Preserve Institution's Character
30	1443	2.667	0.850	Provide Direct Assistance to Citizens
5	1480	2.672	0.929	Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students
3	1494	2.674	0.667	Encourage Students Toward Graduate Studies
20	1508	2.697	0.842	Involve Students in Institutional Governance
19	1496	2.721	0.882	Satisfy Regional Needs
52	1434	2.738	0.991	Insure Will of Full-Time Faculty Prevails
48	1458	2.780	0.966	Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs
2	1467	2.843	0.846	Protect Student Freedom
28	1429	2.930	0.846	Protect Students' Right of Direct Political Action
51	1430	3.102	1.040	Allow for Many Cultures and Lifestyles
35	1484	3.171	0.884	Accommodate Highly Qualified Students Only
39	1441	3.199	0.889	Carry on Applied Research
25	1433	3.482	0.928	Carry on Pure Research

Another interesting finding is the low goal preference for emphasizing the liberal arts, even at the expense of preprofessional and professional programs. This seems to be somewhat inconsistent with the findings at the top of the scale in which the four goal preferences dealing with students appear to be the direct result of liberal education. This finding may have a somewhat different meaning, however, and may reflect a great deal more realism. To have ranked this goal preference much higher on the scale would be to deny some of the realities of the present situation. Preprofessional and professional education programs are oftentimes among the most popular on the campus. Many of these four-year institutions, moreover, are instituting two-year programs. Thus, while many faculty members and administrators may wish to emphasize the liberal arts to a much greater extent, they cannot do so without threatening their very survival. This may also provide additional evidence that the respondents paid attention to the admonishment on the front page of the questionnaire asking them to indicate goal preferences only on the basis of realistic aspirations.

Three of the low ranking goal preferences deal with various kinds of student questions. Our respondents evidently take a dim view of accommodating to multilifestyles, or in encouraging or protecting the students in direct action in social and political causes, or even involving students in the governance of the institution. There is a general feeling among these respondents, as well as among university respondents in the 1971 study, that the preferred role for students is in the classroom and in the laboratory and not on the picket or protest line, or sitting in the dean's chair, or in living according to some "far out" style. Possibly events of the late 1960's did more to harden these attitudes, but undoubtedly they have been present all the time. The preference appears to be for less student activity in all the government of the institution rather than more.

One last comment concerns the goal of accepting only highly qualified students. Undoubtedly the low standing of this goal preference is in part due to the desire on the part of the respondents to be realistic in the face of difficult enrollment problems. In part, however, they may be expressing an educational philosophy based on the history of the institutions and their interest in all men. Many of the 32 schools have either

present or recent-past church affiliations, and it may be difficult for the respondents from these schools to think of themselves as "elitists" in light of the church teachings.

Tables 6, 7, and 8 represent the goal preferences of faculty, administrators, and presidents respectively. There are some rather important differences in the preferences of the presidents as against the preferences of the faculty, so rather than take them up separately, we have combined our analysis to show some of the striking differences and findings.

Of the top ten goal preferences of the presidents, only three of the ten are in the top preferences of the faculty as well. They are:

Goal No.

8. Develop the inner character of students.

50. Secure the institution's financial soundness.

29. Produce a well-rounded student.

Some of the others in the presidents' top ten goal preferences are not far behind on the faculties' list. For example, the presidents rank as their number one preference the establishment and articulation for the institution's several constituencies the purposes of the institution. The faculties have ranked this goal preference number eleven. On the other hand, faculty goal preference number four, concerning good administration, is ranked number eleven on the presidential list. The same might be said for goal preference five on the faculty list: "keep up to date and responsive". On the presidential goal preference list, this is number thirteen. Likewise, goal number seven on the faculty preference list, concerning the protection of the faculty's academic freedom ranks number sixteen on the presidential goal preference list. In general, the presidents' high goal preferences are on matters of more direct concern to the presidential office, namely the building and maintaining of the academic community through its good relations

with the outside, whereas the faculty preferences reflect those matters of faculty concerns, namely to see that the institution is administered well and that professionally the faculty keeps up to date and maintains its quality of educational services.

The bottom ranking goal preferences show no important differences between faculty and presidents. As a matter of fact, there is remarkable uniformity.

TABLE 6

GOAL PREFERENCES--FACULTY

GOAL #	(N)	AVE	ST DEV	
22	1138	1.689	0.703	Maintain Top Quality in All Programs
8	1130	1.726	0.787	Develop Inner Character of Students
29	1119	1.763	0.706	Produce a Well-Rounded Student
21	1108	1.827	0.771	Insure Good Administration
15	1119	1.841	0.673	Keep Up To Date
50	1073	1.876	0.732	Secure Institution's Financial Soundness
4	1134	1.881	0.746	Protect Faculty's Academic Freedom
7	1116	1.894	0.874	Cultivate Intellect of Students
36	1138	1.894	0.706	Help Students Criticize Themselves
17	1141	1.923	0.676	Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity
1	1089	1.957	0.720	Establish and Articulate Purposes of Institution
14	1139	2.017	0.764	Develop Greater Pride in the Institution
12	1115	2.026	0.817	Protect Institution's Autonomy
34	1128	2.067	0.748	Produce Good Citizens
42	1119	2.087	0.756	Create Sense of Community
40	1125	2.089	0.730	Insure Confidence of Contributors
9	1133	2.090	0.863	Elevate Student Culturally
27	1117	2.094	0.754	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Institution
43	1139	2.099	0.736	Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance
45	1133	2.104	0.742	Increase Prestige of Institution
32	1121	2.116	0.779	Maintain Quality Across Range of Programs
46	1133	2.160	0.786	Protect Students' Right of Inquiry
33	1132	2.174	0.783	Insure Institution is Run Democratically
26	1117	2.193	0.749	Keep Costs Low
16	1106	2.211	0.844	Influence Students by Great Ideas
31	1113	2.252	0.784	Insure Favorable Appraisal of Those Validating Quality of Programs
6	1137	2.255	0.857	Develop Loyalty to Institution

10	1134	2.263	0.903	Disseminate New Ideas
11	1124	2.282	0.961	Educate Students Fully
13	1127	2.340	0.898	Increase Faculty's Career Opportunities
37	1138	2.352	0.790	Prepare Students for Careers
38	1137	2.374	0.730	Provide Cultural Leadership
44	1136	2.413	0.745	Provide Student Activities
41	1124	2.451	0.882	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Professional Discipline
24	1101	2.539	0.906	Maximize Students' Possible High Status
49	1122	2.540	1.191	Deepen Theological Understanding
18	1122	2.549	0.912	Preserve Cultural Heritage
47	1104	2.586	0.873	Seek Interinstitutional Cooperation
53	1020	2.619	0.867	Hold Staff From Other Institution's Inducements
52	1086	2.624	0.950	Insure Will of Full-Time Faculty Prevails
30	1090	2.647	0.858	Provide Direct Assistance to Citizens
23	1106	2.679	1.094	Preserve Institution's Character
5	1120	2.682	0.922	Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students
3	1129	2.683	0.677	Encourage Students Toward Graduate Studies
20	1141	2.702	0.856	Involve Students in Institutional Governance
19	1130	2.737	0.880	Satisfy Regional Needs
48	1103	2.754	0.972	Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs
2	1110	2.836	0.857	Protect Student Freedom
28	1078	2.906	0.848	Protect Students' Right of Direct Political Action
51	1084	3.054	1.038	Allow For Many Cultures and Lifestyles
39	1096	3.152	0.878	Carry on Applied Research
35	1121	3.157	0.888	Accommodate Highly Qualified Students Only
25	1088	3.419	0.922	Carry on Pure Research

TABLE 7

GOAL PREFERENCES--ADMINISTRATORS

GOAL #	(N)	AVE	ST DEV	
8	311	1.601	0.663	Develop Inner Character of Students
22	317	1.605	0.655	Maintain Top Quality in all Programs
29	312	1.660	0.636	Produce a Well-Rounded Student
50	303	1.706	0.702	Secure Institution's Financial Soundness
21	312	1.711	0.717	Insure Good Administration
1	311	1.723	0.638	Establish and Articulate Purposes of Institution
14	317	1.801	0.666	Develop Greater Pride in the Institution
15	313	1.824	0.602	Keep Up To Date
40	313	1.856	0.685	Insure Confidence of Contributors
42	313	1.907	0.680	Create Sense of Community
6	315	1.926	0.725	Develop Loyalty to Institution
12	315	1.930	0.814	Protect Institution's Autonomy
34	311	1.948	0.625	Produce Good Citizens
7	314	1.955	0.870	Cultivate Intellect of Students
36	312	1.958	0.657	Help Students Criticize Themselves
26	312	1.967	0.747	Keep Costs Low
17	314	1.990	0.666	Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity
45	313	1.996	0.691	Increase Prestige of Institution
27	309	2.016	0.626	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Institution
9	313	2.028	0.735	Elevate Student Culturally
4	314	2.041	0.724	Protect Faculty's Academic Freedom
32	314	2.047	0.737	Maintain Quality Across Range of Programs
16	308	2.165	0.808	Influence Students by Great Ideas
49	307	2.172	1.060	Deepen Theological Understanding
37	313	2.191	0.739	Prepare Students for Careers
31	313	2.242	0.728	Insure Favorable Appraisal of Those Validating Quality of Programs
11	309	2.255	0.898	Educate Students Fully
44	313	2.297	0.710	Provide Student Activities
46	314	2.302	0.795	Protect Students' Right of Inquiry

43	313	2.329	0.774	Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance
33	313	2.341	0.805	Insure Institution is Run Democratically
24	303	2.359	0.868	Maximize Students' Possible High Status
10	314	2.410	0.945	Disseminate New Ideas
38	313	2.415	0.707	Provide Cultural Leadership
23	309	2.478	1.100	Preserve Institution's Character
41	306	2.549	0.875	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Professional Discipline
18	306	2.562	0.882	Preserve Cultural Heritage
47	311	2.578	0.897	Seek Interinstitutional Cooperation
5	307	2.664	0.957	Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students
3	313	2.670	0.617	Encourage Students Toward Graduate Studies
53	295	2.694	0.862	Hold Staff From Other Institution's Inducements
20	316	2.696	0.806	Involve Students in Institutional Governance
19	314	2.700	0.889	Satisfy Regional Needs
13	312	2.740	0.914	Increase Faculty's Career Opportunities
30	305	2.747	0.818	Provide Direct Assistance to Citizens
2	306	2.849	0.783	Protect Student Freedom
48	305	2.904	0.921	Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs
28	302	3.019	0.823	Protect Students' Right of Direct Political Action
52	299	3.177	0.995	Insure Will of Full-Time Faculty Prevails
35	311	3.228	0.843	Accommodate Highly Qualified Students Only
51	296	3.290	1.023	Allow for Many Cultures and Lifestyles
39	295	3.420	0.903	Carry on Applied Research
25	296	3.709	0.933	Carry on Pure Research

TABLE 8

GOAL PREFERENCES--PRESIDENTS

GOAL #	(N)	AVE	ST DEV		Presidents	All Respondents	Administrators	Faculty
1	31	1.258	0.444	Establish and Articulate Purposes of Institution	1	9	6	11
8	31	1.322	0.475	Develop Inner Character of Students	2	2	1	2
50	30	1.333	0.546	Secure Institution's Financial Soundness	3	5	4	6
40	30	1.433	0.504	Insure Confidence of Contributors	4	15	9	16
22	31	1.451	0.567	Maintain Top Quality in All Programs	5	1	2	1
29	31	1.483	0.569	Produce a Well-Rounded Student	6	3	3	3
26	31	1.548	0.623	Keep Costs Low	7	21	16	24
16	31	1.548	0.623	Influence Students By Great Ideas	8	25	23	25
42	30	1.566	0.626	Create Sense of Community	9	16	10	15
12	31	1.580	0.847	Protect Institution's Autonomy	10	13	12	13
21	30	1.600	0.770	Insure Good Administration	11	4	5	4
14	31	1.612	0.558	Develop Greater Pride in the Institution	12	12	7	12
15	31	1.612	0.558	Keep Up To Date	13	6	8	5
6	31	1.645	0.660	Develop Loyalty to Institution	14	23	11	27
7	31	1.709	0.972	Cultivate Intellect of Students	15	8	14	8
4	30	1.733	0.639	Protect Faculty's Academic Freedom	16	10	21	7
36	30	1.766	0.626	Help Students Criticize Themselves	17	7	15	9
27	31	1.774	0.560	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Institution	18	19	19	18
49	30	1.800	1.095	Deepen Theological Understanding	19	34	24	36
34	31	1.806	0.542	Produce Good Citizens	20	14	13	14
9	31	1.806	0.601	Elevate Student Cultrually	21	17	20	17
32	31	1.838	0.734	Maintain Quality Across Range of Programs	22	20	22	21
17	31	1.870	0.618	Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity	23	11	17	10
11	31	1.903	0.746	Educate Students Fully	24	28	27	29
31	31	1.967	0.752	Insure Favorable Appraisal of Those Validating Quality of Programs	25	27	26	26
45	30	2.000	0.787	Increase Prestige of Institution	26	18	18	20

44	30	2.066	0.691	Provide Student Activities	27	32	28	33
46	30	2.066	0.827	Protect Students' Right of Inquiry	28	24	29	22
43	29	2.068	0.798	Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance	29	22	30	19
33	31	2.129	0.718	Insure Institution is Run Democratically	30	26	31	23
37	30	2.133	0.628	Prepare Students for Careers	31	30	25	31
38	30	2.166	0.746	Provide Cultural Leadership	32	31	34	32
18	30	2.200	0.805	Preserve Cultural Heritage	33	37	37	37
23	30	2.200	1.242	Preserve Institution's Character	34	40	35	42
24	29	2.206	0.773	Maximize Students' Possible High Status	35	36	32	35
47	30	2.233	0.858	Seek Interinstitutional Cooperation	36	38	38	38
10	31	2.258	0.855	Disseminate New Ideas	37	29	33	28
41	29	2.344	0.897	Reward Individuals Based on Contribution to Professional Discipline	38	35	36	34
48	29	2.413	1.018	Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs	39	47	47	47
2	28	2.428	0.741	Protect Student Freedom	40	48	46	48
13	30	2.500	0.937	Increase Faculty's Career Opportunities	41	33	44	30
3	30	2.500	0.572	Encourage Students Toward Graduate Studies	42	43	40	44
53	29	2.517	0.949	Hold Staff from Other Institution's Inducement	43	39	41	39
5	31	2.580	1.118	Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students	44	42	39	43
20	31	2.580	0.807	Involve Students in Institutional Governance	45	44	42	45
19	30	2.633	0.808	Satisfy Regional Needs	46	45	43	46
30	31	2.709	0.824	Provide Direct Assistance to Citizens	47	41	45	41
28	30	2.733	0.907	Protect Students' Right of Direct Political Action	48	49	48	49
35	31	3.064	0.853	Accommodate Highly Qualified Students Only	49	46	50	40
52	30	3.200	1.126	Insure Will of Full-Time Faculty Prevails	50	46	49	52
51	29	3.275	1.098	Allow for Many Cultures and Lifestyles	51	50	51	50
39	28	3.321	0.772	Carry on Applied Research	52	52	52	51
25	30	3.600	0.855	Carry on Pure Research	53	53	53	53

CHAPTER III

GOAL CORRELATIONS

In considering the ranks of the entire list of 53 goals, we used two analytical methods. First, we computed rank order correlations for the entire 53 goal table, correlating "is" and "should be" ranks of each of the four major tabulations we have been discussing. Spearman coefficients for each group are as follows:

All Respondents	.7858
Faculty	.7257
Administrators	.8074
Presidents	.9244

We might consider these coefficients a measure of stability or satisfaction. The presidents with their very high correlation of rank between perceived goals and goal preferences are evidently more satisfied with the way things are than are the faculty who exhibit a lower correlation. One possible explanation for the high rank order correlation of the presidents is that presidents are more inclined to support the status quo. By the very nature of their position, they must demonstrate some enthusiasm for the institution they are at or they will not survive; or perhaps they are more inclined to believe that preferred goals have already arrived. Furthermore, presidents are more "local" in the Gouldner sense[1] in that their ties to other presidents, and organizations of academic administrators, especially presidents, is much weaker than the faculties' ties to a discipline, such as economics or chemistry. The president's whole attention must be focused on his institution, whereas the faculty can ordinarily take a more detached view. As an aside, faculty at independent institutions are not likely to be as strongly tied to the discipline as are faculty in universities; nevertheless, the tie is still there.

---

[1] Gouldner, Alvin W., "Cosmopolitans and Locals: Toward an Analysis of Latent Social Roles," Administrative Sciences Quarterly, 2 vols. (1957-58) II:281-306.

Lastly, on tables 1 through 4 the "is" "should be" ranking for each group is presented side by side. By inspection, it is quite obvious that any major differences between the two rankings come from the upper half of the perceived goals or the goals preferences, as the case may be, rather than the lower half. If only the upper half were used, the correlations would be lower. A significant portion of the differences are on those goals that the respondents feel are among the most important, indicating that a great deal of lively discussion must take place on each individual campus over some of these issues.

CHAPTER IV

MAJOR GOAL DISCREPANCIES

The second type of analysis measuring the differences between the perceived goals and goal preferences is to examine the major discrepancies in each table. In those cases where a goal preference (should be) ranks significantly higher than a goal (is), that goal is probably underemphasized. We have chosen to call this a "sin of omission". Conversely, in those cases where the goal preference (should be) ranks significantly lower than the goal (is), we have termed this a "sin of commission". Tables 9 through 12 present the sins of omission and commission for all respondents, faculty members, administrators, and presidents in that order. It should be noted that the only goals listed are those in which the differences are at least nine places. Probably the most important of these tables is table 10 of the faculty and table 12 of the presidents. These two tables reveal that the list of "sins," both of omission and commission, is much greater for the faculty than for the presidents. Furthermore, the differences between "is" and "should be" scores are much greater for the faculty than for the presidents. The observations are, of course, entirely consistent with the rank order correlations where the presidents have much higher correlations between goals and goal preferences than do the faculties.

What do these two tables have in common? In other words, are there sins of omission recognized by the presidents that are also recognized by the faculty, or are they completely different? Apparently, there are only two sins of omission on the presidents' list that are also on the faculties' list. These are:

Goal No.

27. Reward individuals based on their contribution to the institution.

21. Insure good administration.

TABLE 9

SINS OF OMISSION AND SINS OF COMISSION

ALL RESPONDENTS

Omission ("should be" ranks at least 9 places higher than "is".)

Goal No.

27. Reward individuals based on their contribution to the institution.
21. Insure good administration.
14. Develop greater pride in the institution.
9. Elevate student culturally.
22. Maintain top quality in all programs.
7. Cultivate intellect of students.
10. Disseminate new ideas.
36. Help students develop objectivity to examine beliefs critically.
15. Keep up to date.
41. Reward individuals based on their contribution to a professional discipline.

Commission ("should be" ranks at least 9 places lower than "is".)

Goal No.

23. Preserve institution's character.
31. Insure favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs.
37. Prepare students for useful careers.
26. Keep costs low.
48. Emphasize liberal arts even at the expense of preprofessional, pregraduate, or vocational programs.
40. Insure confidence of contributors.
49. Deepen theological understanding.
24. Maximize students' possible high status.
12. Protect institution's autonomy.
20. Involve students in institutional governance.
2. Protect student freedom.

TABLE 10

SINS OF OMISSION AND SINS OF COMISSION

FACULTY

Omission ("should be" ranks at least 9 places higher than "is".)

Goal No.	
27.	Reward individuals based on their contribution to the institution.
14.	Develop greater pride in the institution.
21.	Insure good administration.
9.	Elevate students culturally.
22.	Maintain top quality in all programs.
7.	Cultivate intellect of students.
33.	Insure institution is run democratically.
41.	Reward individuals based on their contribution to a professional discipline.
52.	Insure will of full-time faculty prevails.
13.	Increase faculty's career opportunities.
36.	Help students develop objectivity to examine beliefs critically.
15.	Keep up to date.
43.	Involve faculty in institutional governance.
10.	Disseminate new ideas.

Commission ("should be" ranks at least 9 places lower than "is".)

Goal No.	
23.	Preserve the institution's character.
31.	Insure favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs.
37.	Prepare students for useful careers.
26.	Keep costs low.
49.	Deepen theological understanding.
40.	Insure confidence of contributors.
48.	Emphasize liberal arts even at the expense of preprofessional, pregraduate, or vocational programs.
12.	Protect institution's autonomy.
44.	Provide student activities.
24.	Maximize students' possible high status.
45.	Increase prestige of institution.
2.	Protect student freedom.

TABLE 11

SINS OF OMISSION AND SINS OF COMMISSION

ADMINISTRATORS

Omission ("should be" ranks at least 9 places higher than "is".)

Goal No.	
14.	Develop greater pride in the institution.
6.	Develop loyalty to the institution.
27.	Reward individuals based on contribution to institution.
21.	Insure good administration.
10.	Disseminate new ideas.
5.	Provide special training for part-time adult students.
42.	Create sense of community.
11.	Educate students fully.
41.	Reward individuals based on their contribution to a professional discipline.
9.	Elevate students culturally.

Commission ("should be" ranks at least 9 places lower than "is".)

Goal No.	
31.	Insure favorable appraisal of those validating quality of programs.
23.	Preserve the institution's character.
4.	Protect faculty's academic freedom.
48.	Emphasize liberal arts even at the expense of preprofessional, pregraduate, or vocational programs.
43.	Involve faculty in institutional governance.
37.	Prepare students for useful careers.
12.	Protect institution's autonomy.
26.	Keep costs low.
13.	Increase faculty's career opportunities.
2.	Protect student freedom.

TABLE 12

SINS OF OMISSION AND SINS OF COMMISSION

PRESIDENTS

Omission ("should be" ranks at least 9 places higher than "is".)

Goal No.	
16.	Influence students with great ideas.
27.	Reward individuals based on contribution to institution.
11.	Educate students fully.
21.	Insure good administration.
38.	Provide cultural leadership.

Commission ("should be" ranks at least 9 places lower than "is".)

Goal No.	
37.	Prepare students for useful careers.
4.	Protect faculty's academic freedom.
43.	Involve faculty in institutional governance.
12.	Protect institution's autonomy.
32.	Maintain quality across range of programs.
33.	Insure institution is run democratically.
2.	Protect student freedom.

The former represents a problem common to all of higher education, namely, defining the basis upon which compensation is determined. Evidently, the presidents and the faculties alike feel that not enough attention is paid to services to the institution. However, the faculties believe that not enough attention is paid to the reward system reflecting one's contribution to one's profession as well. In other words, the faculties believe that both of these factors should be considered to a much higher degree than they are.

The other goal on both lists is to insure good administration. The presidents would probably agree that there is room for improvement in their administration. Undoubtedly the faculty is sure there is. Administrators, including the presidents, are generally of the opinion that the faculties are never satisfied with administration.

Turning to the "sins of commission," there are three goals that the presidents and the faculties agree are overemphasized. The first is the preparation of students for useful careers. This emphasis gives rise to a general complaint which is voiced by many people in liberal education. Both faculties and presidents may like to think that the student should be pursuing knowledge entirely for its own sake, but in our culture they are well aware that this is not the case. Therefore, the goal of preparing students for useful careers ranks quite high as a measure of reality, but if presidents and faculties had their way, career preparation would be considerably deemphasized.

The second goal respondents find overemphasized is the protection of institutional autonomy. Most people are less concerned with the identification of the institution than they are with carrying on its mission, even under some different identification. The goal remains a relatively high one, however--number ten for presidents and number thirteen for faculty members. The faculties also feel that the goal of preserving the institution's unique character has been greatly overemphasized. Thus, they join the presidents who did not rate this goal highly in the first place. Perhaps the lessened emphasis on these two goals holds promise for further interinstitutional cooperation, an area of activity described in another report of the Study of Independent Higher Education in Indiana.

Finally, the goal of protecting the student's freedom in dress and such is thought to be over-emphasized. This is a fairly low-ranking goal which apparently might have been more important in years past. Currently, both presidents and faculties feel that student freedoms of this kind have been overdone. Whether they are prepared to take stronger steps to curtail them remains to be seen.

One additional "sin of commission" from the presidential respondents is that academic freedom should be deemphasized. The faculties obviously do not agree. They believe it should be further emphasized with the rank moving from twelfth place on the "is" to seventh on the "should be."

Two goals the faculties believe are "sins of omission" but the presidents believe are "sins of commission" are:

Goal No.	
43.	To involve faculty in institutional governance.
33.	Insure that the institution is run democratically.

The presidents believe that both of these two are overemphasized and that the institutions are committing "sins of commission." The faculties, on the other hand, believe that these two goals are underemphasized. Probably this is what might be expected, given the quasi-adversary relationship which seems to prevail between most faculties and administrations. The fact that these findings are consistent with other studies bears out in a small way the validity of the study itself.

Among the most interesting "sins" are two of the faculties' "sins of commission" goals. First, the faculties believe that the goal of deepening theological understanding is overemphasized. For all respondents combined this goal drops from sixteenth on the perceived list to nineteenth on the preferred. For all faculty members combined, it drops from eighteenth to thirty-sixth. There is, however, considerable variation on this judgment from one institution to another. For three institutions it is and remains the number one goal. At two institutions it is dead last and stays

there. It rises nine places at one institution, seventeen places at another. It falls from first place to second or sixth or seventh at several institutions, and tumbles dramatically from fourth to thirty-first at another.

Likewise, the downgrading which faculties believe should be placed on the goal of emphasizing the liberal arts, even at the expense of the preprofessional and professional programs, requires some interpretation. One possible explanation is that faculties are genuinely upset with the state of education in the liberal arts and believe that its value to education has been overemphasized. A more likely explanation is the one already advanced, namely that the preprofessional and professional programs are increasingly the more viable part of the institution's programs.

Table 13 shows the correlation between the various groups we have been analyzing. Not surprisingly, the correlation between the all respondents and the faculties is very high, for a substantial portion of the total population is made up of faculty. The lowest rank order correlation is between the faculty and the presidents, both on the perceived goals and on the goal preferences.

Thus far we have dealt only with the major changes in rank between the two, but it is evident that there are additional differences between faculties and presidents over the entire range of goals. As indicated earlier, the variations tend to be in the upper half rather than the lower half, indicating stronger agreement on what is of lesser importance in these institutions.

TABLE 13

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS:
RESPONDENT GROUPS

	Spearman Coefficients	
	Is	Should Be
All Respondents and Faculty	.9974	.9943
All Respondents and Administrators	.9761	.9570
All Respondents and Presidents	.8701	.9136
Administrators and Presidents	.8989	.9616
Administrators and Faculty	.9635	.9319
Faculty and Presidents	.8487	.8883

	Kendall Coefficients	
	Is	Should Be
All Respondents and Faculty	.9710	.9536
All Respondents and Administrators	.8752	.8360
All Respondents and Presidents	.6952	.7533
Administrators and Presidents	.7388	.8476
Administrators and Faculty	.8462	.7925
Faculty and Presidents	.6691	.7184

CHAPTER V

INSTITUTIONAL DISTINCTIONS

Thus far we have been dealing with the classification of people who responded to the questionnaire, namely presidents, administrators, and faculty members. Now we turn to classifications of schools. All of the schools in the study have in common the fact that they are privately controlled rather than public or state controlled. In addition, they are all located in Indiana, and they are all (with one present exception) four-year, college degree institutions with various types of graduate work offered in some cases.

In considering various kinds of classifications, we have relied primarily on the classification of the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education.[1] Their published volume lists all of the schools involved in this study. The 32 institutions and their classifications are as follows:

Doctoral Granting Universities-I

University of Notre Dame

Technical Institutes

Rose-Hulman Institute of Technology
Indiana Institute of Technology
Northwood Institute[2]

---

[1] A Classification of Institutions of Higher Education, A Technical Report sponsored by the Carnegie Commission on Higher Education (Berkeley, California: By the Commission, 1973).

[2] Northwood Institute is classified as a liberal arts college; however, in examining the program we deemed it appropriate to classify it as a technical institute. An examination of top-ranking goals compared to the other two technical institutes confirms the fact that our classification appears proper. This is the four year institution that has recently become a two year institution.

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges-I

Butler University
DePauw University
Indiana Central College
University of Evansville
Valparaiso University

Comprehensive Universities and Colleges-II

Manchester College
Tri-State College

Liberal Arts Colleges-I

Earlham College
Hanover College
Saint Mary's College
Wabash College

Liberal Arts Colleges-II

Anderson College
Bethel College
Calumet College
Concordia Senior College
Fort Wayne Bible College
Franklin College
Goshen College
Grace College
Huntington College
Marian College
Marion College
Oakland City College
Saint Francis College
Saint Joseph's College
Saint Mary-of-the-Woods College
Saint Meinrad College
Taylor University

In addition to this classification, we have decided to make several other classifications to see whether certain factors might be important in determining goal ranking. Among these other classifications are the following:

Institutions with direct religious affiliation

a. All Catholic institutions

b. All religious non-Catholic institutions

Still another grouping is by size of enrollment. We have made the following breakdown based on full-time enrolled students in the fall of 1973. Those with approximately 3,000 students or over we have classified as major institutions, and those with under 3,000 are classified as nonmajor. The four schools listed as major institutions are:

1. Butler University
2. University of Evansville
3. University of Notre Dame
4. Valparaiso University

In each case we have compared various types of schools with each other using rank order correlations. Table 14 lists all the correlations between all possible combinations of schools. Immediately one is struck by the fact that with one exception (Liberal Arts-I and Comprehensive-II) all the correlations of goal preferences (should be) are higher than the corresponding goal correlations (is). What this suggests is that these institutions aspire to move in directions that will make them even more like one another than they already are.

The correlations in table 14 are interesting although somewhat indecisive. It appears that the Liberal Arts Colleges-II are more closely allied to Liberal Arts Colleges-I and to Comprehensive Colleges-II than any of the others. This is probably to be expected, because these schools are more closely allied in size and general background. In all cases there are considerable differences between the liberal arts colleges and the technical institutes and, of course, our one doctoral granting university. The technical institutes in particular are evidently more student-career oriented than the liberal arts colleges.

The highest correlation appears to be between the Comprehensive Colleges-II and the Comprehensive Colleges-I. Evidently these schools appear to be more closely akin in outlook than any other group. Undoubtedly an examination of these individual institutions will reveal some of the reasons why the line of demarcation between these two classifications is not very distinct.

TABLE 14

RANK ORDER CORRELATIONS:
INSTITUTIONAL TYPES

	Spearman Coefficients	
	Is	Should Be
Liberal Arts II and Liberal Arts I	.7702	.8336
Liberal Arts II and Comprehensive II	.8053	.8591
Liberal Arts II and Comprehensive I	.7138	.8485
Liberal Arts II and Technical	.6907	.7534
Liberal Arts II and Doctoral I	.6883	.7828
Liberal Arts I and Comprehensive II	.8160	.7749
Liberal Arts I and Comprehensive I	.7702	.8406
Liberal Arts I and Technical	.6388	.6560
Liberal Arts I and Doctoral I	.7296	.7892
Comprehensive II and Comprehensive I	.8553	.9422
Comprehensive II and Technical	.8642	.8945
Comprehensive II and Doctoral I	.6201	.7051
Comprehensive I and Technical	.7041	.8532
Comprehensive I and Doctoral I	.6499	.7704
Technical and Doctoral I	.5299	.6044

What this table shows is that there is some correlation, and even a high degree of correlation, between those institutions we think of as liberal arts colleges, regardless of the classification. The only time the correlation appears to lessen is when the liberal arts colleges are compared against the technical institutes or the doctoral granting university.

The other classifications we used, namely the major schools as opposed to the nonmajor schools and the Catholic institutions as contrasted with the religious non-Catholic institutions, showed remarkably high rank order correlations.

As in the university studies, size of the student body does not appear to be a major variable in goal ranking. The Spearman correlation coefficient between the major and the nonmajor schools was .8418 for the perceived goals and .9322 for the preferred goals.

The Catholic institutions are correlated with the religious non-Catholic schools to an even higher degree. The Spearman correlation coefficient for the perceived goals was .9503 and for the goal preferences .9607. This finding is especially interesting when contrasted with the correlation between the Catholic institutions and the doctoral granting university (Notre Dame) which is only .7513. The fact that these are all Catholic schools indicates that the institutional type, namely "university," is much more significant than the question of religious orientation of the school. Undoubtedly, if there were a doctoral granting university with direct affiliation with a religious non-Catholic body, the outcome would be much the same.

How stable are these institutions as expressed by correlation of goals and goal preferences? Table 15 is an attempt to measure the varying degrees of stability within the classifications. The gamma scores represent the relationship between the perceived goals and goal preferences. In all cases the different groups such as the Liberal Arts-II and the Liberal Arts-I are relatively stable. The lowest gamma (.643) is found at the Comprehensive Colleges-I. This is still a relatively high score and is not sufficiently below some of the others to be significant. Undoubtedly, the schools in this category are in the transition stage between a liberal arts college and a type of university. Therefore, there may be areas of conflict that tend to make for discrepancies between goals and goal preferences.

It is interesting to note that the technical institutes appear to have a significantly larger gamma score, indicating that there are relatively few areas of conflict between their perceived goals and their goal preferences. They appear to have a much better meeting of the minds as to what they believe is important in their institution and what should be important as well.

TABLE 15

RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN "IS" AND "SHOULD BE"
USING GAMMA[3] SCORES

	Gamma
Liberal Arts II	.756
Liberal Arts I	.792
Comprehensive II	.732
Comprehensive I	.643
Technical	.884
Doctoral I	.661

OTHER CLASSIFICATIONS

Catholic Institutions	.736
Non-Catholic Institutions	.741
Major Institutions	.533
Nonmajor Institutions	.709

---

[3] A measure of association of two variables in common use in social statistics. See Goodman, Leo A. and Kruskal, William H., "Measures of Association for Cross Classifications." Journal of the American Statistical Association, XLIX (December, 1954): 732-64.

Turning to the "other classifications," the only matter of interest is the relatively low gamma score (.533) for the major institutions. These schools are the same ones that are also found in the Carnegie classification under Comprehensive-I, hence the interpretive comments mentioned above with reference to Comprehensive-I schools apply also the "Major" institutions.

The conclusion drawn from table 15, therefore, is that these organizations are quite stable. It must be remembered, however, that these correlations are only for the classifications of schools as described.

When we examine the responses of the individual schools, considerable diversity is found. A great variance occurs, as mentioned earlier, in the goal of deepening theological understanding. Eleven institutions perceive this to be among the top ten goals; nine place it in the bottom ten. In all, sixteen goals meet the criterion of being in the top ten goal perceptions of one institution, but in the bottom ten of at least one other institution.[4]

Satisfying regional needs rates at the top for three institutions; at the bottom for sixteen. Similarly, twenty schools perceived the goal of providing special training for part-time adult students as being among the bottom ten goals, while four schools place it within the top ten. Involving students in institutional governance is given a top ten rating at four schools; a bottom ten rating at four others. Table 16 illustrates the range of this divergence for both goal perceptions and preferences.

Turning to goal preferences, we see a number of substantial shifts, most of which suggest movement in the direction of greater commonality. On the preferred list only five goals meet the criterion of being in the top ten goal preferences of one institution but in the bottom ten of at least one other institution. Fewer

---

[4] The reader is reminded that the data from individual campuses include all respondents. Faculty reponses make up the largest portion of total responses on each campus as they do for the statewide composite.

TABLE 16

RANGE OF INSTITUTIONAL DIVERSITY

Goal No.	IS		SHOULD BE	
	No. Citing In Top Ten	No. Citing In Bottom Ten	No. Citing In Top Ten	No. Citing In Bottom Ten
5. Provide Special Training for Part-Time Adult Students	4	20	1	12
6. Develop Loyalty to Institution	2	1	1	-
11. Educate Students Fully	1	1	2	-
14. Develop Greater Pride in Institution	2	1	10	-
17. Promote Scholarship, Science, and Creativity	6	1	12	-
18. Preserve Cultural Heritage	1	3	-	6
19. Satisfy Regional Needs	3	16	-	16
20. Involve Students in Institutional Governance	4	4	-	12
21. Insure Good Administration	4	1	25	-
23. Preserve Institution's Character	15	-	3	14
24. Maximize Students' Possible High Status	4	1	1	3

33. Insure Institution is Run Democratically	3	1	1	-
37. Prepare Students for Careers	10	1	5	1
43. Involve Faculty in Institutional Governance	10	1	3	-
44. Provide Student Activities	1	2	-	1
48. Emphasize Liberal Arts Even at Expense of Other Programs	3	6	-	17
49. Deepen Theological Understanding	16	7	11	9

schools give either a top ten or bottom ten score to the goal of providing special training for part-time adult students. Deepening theological understanding drops from the top ten list of perceived goals in five schools, but is found on the preferred bottom ten list for nine schools as compared with five on the perceived.

The greatest shifts occur in response to the goals of developing institutional pride, involving students in institutional governance, insuring good administration, and emphasizing the liberal arts even at the expense of other programs.

APPENDIX A

METHODOLOGY

For research purposes, the data we obtained will be added to the growing body of data concerning goals and goal preferences of educational institutions where it will serve as a base for comparative analysis.

We acquired the data for this study by using a questionnaire with all the inherent strengths and weaknesses of this method of research. These will not be enumerated here but are well described in social research literature. We modified the questionnaire from one on university goals that was used in making two studies--one in 1964 and another in 1971. Certain goal statements were added to the University Goals questionnaire and several were removed. The net result was a total of 53 goal statements rather than the 47 which were in the university study. The classification of statements of goals and a discussion of the theoretical base for such a study is found in Gross and Grambsch, Changes in University Organization: 1964-1971, Chapter 1.[1] Further elaboration is excluded here. Questionnaires were completed by all 32 presidents and by 318 other administrators and 1161 faculty members at the 32 institutions, making a total of 1511. In general, the rate of response was extremely high in most of the institutions. In some cases virtually 100% of the faculty and administrators completed the questionnaire. In others the percentage was lower, but in no case did it drop below 70%. Statistically, therefore, the samples are large enough to provide significant findings.

Unlike the study of university goals where the common denominator was university status as determined by a number of relatively simple criteria, the 32 private institutions are not quite so easily classified. According to the classification presented by the Carnegie Commission, there is a total of 21 of the 32 Indiana private institutions classified as liberal arts colleges, seven are classified as comprehensive universities and colleges, one is classified as a doctoral granting university, and three are classified as engineering and technology colleges. This would seem to indicate a certain amount of diversity, but it must be kept in mind that all but one of the institutions (the doctoral granting institution) have predominantly undergraduate student bodies and are not considered major factors in

---

[1] Gross, Edward and Grambsch, Paul V., Changes in University Organization: 1964-1971 (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co.), pp. 1-42.

graduate work either in the State of Indiana or throughout the United States. From time to time in this Study, we have compared these various groupings, and have analyzed degrees of similarity and differences.

APPENDIX B

study of independent higher education in indiana

INVENTORY OF INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

Intended for planning purposes at the campus level as well as for identifying the degrees of diversity among institutions at the sector level, this instrument, an adaptation of a questionnaire created by Paul V. Grambsch and Edward Gross (authors of *University Goals & Academic Power*) invites you to tell us what the aims or goals of your institution are presently, and what they should be. What are you and what should you be trying to accomplish? We should like you to react to the following list of commonly claimed aims, intentions, or goals of a college or university in two different ways:

(1) How important *is* each aim at this institution?

(2) How important *should* the aim be at this institution?

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know can't say or does not apply
EXAMPLE: to serve as substitute parents	**is**	☐	☐	☒	☐	☐	☐
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☒	☐

A person who had checked the alternatives in the manner shown above would be expressing his perception that the aim, intention or goal, "to serve as substitute parents," *is* of medium importance at his institution but that he believes it *should be of no importance* as an aim, intention or goal of his institution.

In responding to the "should be" aspect of these goals, keep in mind the resource limitations of your institution. Since many of these goals have implications for the time, talent and financial resources of your institution, it may be that some goals can become more important only if some others become less important.

****

This questionnaire is being given to a carefully selected sample of administrators and faculty members at each of the independent colleges and universities in the State of Indiana. It will provide us with a comprehensive picture of how these influential members of the campus community view their institution.

The success of the study depends completely upon the kindness and generosity of each respondent. We hope that the results will be of value to you in your institution. They will appear in reports of the Study of Independent Higher Education in Indiana and will also be returned to your campus in tabular form for local planning purposes. These reports will not identify individual respondents.

The questionnaire is completely confidential. No one will see it except the members of the research staff.

Which of the following best describes your role at this institution:

☐ administrator

☐ faculty member

— faculty rank _____

			of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know can't say or does not apply	For office use only
1.	establish and articulate for the institution's several constituencies the purposes of the institution	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
2.	protect student freedom in matters of dress, social patterns, and off-campus activities	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
3.	encourage students to go into graduate work	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
4.	protect the faculty's right to academic freedom	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
5.	provide special training for part-time adult students, through evening courses, special short courses, etc.	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
6.	develop loyalty on the part of the faculty and staff to the institution, rather than only to their own jobs or professional concerns	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
7.	produce a student who, whatever else may be done to him, has had his intellect cultivated to the maximum	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
8.	develop the inner character of students so that they can make sound, correct moral choices	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
9.	make a discriminating person of the student, one who is elevated culturally, has good taste, and makes choices accordingly	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
10.	serve as a center for the dissemination of new ideas that will change the society, whether those ideas are in science, literature, the arts, or politics	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
11.	educate to their utmost capacities students representing a full range of academic, cultural, ethnic, and socio-economic groupings	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
12.	protect the independence and autonomy of this institution	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
13.	make this a place in which faculty have maximum opportunity to pursue their careers in a manner satisfactory to them by their own criteria	is	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know can't say or does not apply	For office use only
14. develop greater pride on the part of the faculty, staff and students in their institution and the things it stands for	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
15. keep up to date and responsive	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
16. make sure the student is permanently affected (in mind and spirit) by the great ideas of the great minds of history	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
17. train students in methods of scholarship and/or scientific research and/or creative endeavor	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
18. serve as a center for the preservation of the cultural heritage	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
19. orient ourselves to the satisfaction of the special needs and problems of the immediate geographical region	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
20. involve students in the government of the institution	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
21. make sure that the university is run by those selected according to their ability to attain the goals of the institution in the most efficient manner possible	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
22. maintain top quality in all programs we engage in	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
23. keep this place from becoming something different from what it is now; that is, preserve its peculiar emphasis and point of view, its "character"	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
24. provide the student with skills, attitudes, contacts, and experiences which maximize the likelihood of his occupying a high status in life and a position of leadership in society	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
25. carry on pure research	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
26. keep costs down as low as possible through more efficient utilization of time, and space, reduction of course duplication, etc.	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know can't say or does not apply	For office use only
27.	make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisites and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to the functioning of this institution	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
28.	protect and facilitate the students' right to advocate direct action of a political or social kind, and any attempts on their part to organize efforts to attain political or social goals	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
29.	produce a well-rounded student, that is one whose physical, social, moral, intellectual and aesthetic potentialities have all been cultivated	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
30.	assist citizens directly through advice, consultation, and the provision of useful or needed facilities and services	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
31.	insure the favorable appraisal of those who validate the quality of the programs we offer (validating groups include accrediting bodies, professional societies, scholarly peers at other institutions and respected persons in intellectual or artistic circles)	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
32.	maintain a balanced level of quality across the whole range of programs we engage in	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
33.	make sure the institution is run democratically insofar as that is feasible	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
34.	produce a student who is able to perform his citizenship responsibilities effectively	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
35.	accommodate only students of high academic potential	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
36.	assist students to develop objectivity about themselves and their beliefs and hence examine those beliefs critically	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
37.	prepare students specifically for useful careers	is ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know can't say or does not apply	For office use only
38.	provide cultural leadership for the community through institution-sponsored programs in the arts, public lectures by distinguished persons, athletic events, and other performances, displays or celebrations which present the best of culture, popular or not	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
39.	carry on applied research	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
40.	insure the continued confidence and hence support of those who contribut substantially (other than students and recipients of services) to the finances and other material resource needs of the institution	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
41.	make sure that salaries, teaching assignments, perquisities, and privileges always reflect the contribution that the person involved is making to *his own profession or discipline*	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
42.	create a sense of community through close personal interaction as a vital part of the academic mission of the institution	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
43.	involve faculty in the government of the institution	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
44.	provide a full round of student activities	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
45.	increase the prestige of the institution or, if you believe it is already extr ely high, ensure maintenance of t.at prestige	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
46.	protect and facilitate the students' right to inquire into, investigate, and examine critically any idea or program that they might get interested in	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
47.	seek closer ties of cooperation with other colleges and universities to share resources even at some cost to the autonomy of this institution	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
48.	emphasize instruction in the liberal arts even at the expense of pre-professional, pre-graduate, or vocational programs	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
49.	sharpen student's awareness of their religious heritage and deepen their theological understanding	**is** ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
		should be ☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know can't say or does not apply	For office use only
50. secure the financial soundness of this institution (especially through applying the latest techniques of management systems to the institution's operating problems)	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
51. create an environment that offers a wide variety of lifestyles and sub-cultures	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
52. make sure that on *all* important issues (not only currriculum), the will of the full-time faculty shall prevail	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
53. hold our staff in the face of inducements offered by other institutions	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
	should be	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—

In spite of the length of the above list, it is entirely possible that we have not included aims or goals which are important at this institution, or we may have badly stated such an aim or goal; if so, please take this opportunity to correct us by writing them in below.

		of absolutely top importance	of great importance	of medium importance	of little importance	of no importance	don't know can't say or does not apply	For office use only
54. _____	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
_____	**should be**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
55. _____	**is**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—
_____	**should be**	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	☐	—